IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

CANDIDA STOKES,	*	
	*	
Plaintiff,	*	
	*	
vs.	*	**CASE NO.: 2:07-cv-686**
	*	
CITY OF MONTGOMERY;	*	
ARTHUR BAYLOR, Chief of Police,	*	
and BOBBY BRIGHT, Mayor, in	*	
their individual and official capacities	*	
	*	
	*	
Defendants.	*	

ANSWER OF DEFENDANTS CITY OF MONTGOMERY,
ARTHUR BAYLOR, AND BOBBY BRIGHT

Comes now the City of Montgomery, Arthur Baylor, and Bobby Bright, above named Defendants, and hereby file their answer to the complaint of the Plaintiff Candida Stokes as follows:

1. Defendants admit that this Court is the proper Court to hear the matters asserted by the Plaintiff.
2. Defendants admit the allegations in paragraph two.
3. Defendants admit that the Plaintiff is a white, female citizen of the United State and a resident of the State of Alabama. Defendants deny all other allegations in paragraph three and demand strict proof thereof.
4. Defendants admit the allegations in paragraph four.
5. Defendants admit the allegations in paragraph five.
6. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph six and demand strict proof

thereof.

7. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph seven and demand strict proof thereof.

8. Defendants admit the allegations in paragraph eight.

9. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph nine and demand strict proof thereof.

10. Defendants admit the allegations in paragraph ten.

11. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph eleven and demand strict proof thereof.

12. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph twelve and demand strict proof thereof.

13. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph thirteen and demand strict proof thereof.

14. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph fourteen and demand strict proof thereof.

15. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph fifteen and demand strict proof thereof.

16. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph sixteen and demand strict proof thereof.

17. Defendants admit the allegations in paragraph seventeen.

18. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph eighteen and demand strict proof thereof.

19. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph nineteen and demand strict proof

thereof.

20. Defendants reference and incorporate herein their responses to paragraphs 1 through 19 above as if fully setout herein.

21. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph twenty one and demand strict proof thereof.

22. Defendants admit the allegations in paragraph twenty two.

23. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph twenty three and demand strict proof thereof.

24. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph twenty four and demand strict proof thereof.

25. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph twenty five and demand strict proof thereof.

26. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph twenty six and demand strict proof thereof.

27. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph twenty seven and demand strict proof thereof.

28. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph twenty eight and demand strict proof thereof.

29. Defendants reference and incorporate herein their responses to paragraphs 1 through 28 above as if fully setout herein.

30. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph thirty and demand strict proof thereof.

31. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph thirty one and demand strict

proof thereof.

32. Defendants reference and incorporate herein their responses to paragraphs 1 through 31 above as if fully setout herein.

33. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph thirty three and demand strict proof thereof.

34. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph thirty four and demand strict proof thereof.

35. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph thirty five and demand strict proof thereof.

36. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph thirty six and demand strict proof thereof.

37. Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph thirty seven and demand strict proof thereof.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

FIRST AFFIMATIVE DENSE

1. Defendants generally deny all material allegations of the Complaint and deny that Plaintiff is entitled to any relief.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

2. Defendants plead the general issue and deny any allegations not specifically denied.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFNSE

3. Defendants aver that Plaintiff's Complaint and each count and cause thereof fails to state a cause of action against Defendants upon which relief can be

granted.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

4. Defendants plead that all of their employment decisions regarding Plaintiff were made for a legitimate, non-discriminatory business reason.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

5. Defendant City of Montgomery pleads immunity from any claims of intentional acts. A municipality cannot commit intentional acts or act with malice.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

6. Defendant City of Montgomery pleads immunity from punitive damages.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

7. Defendants plead substantive, qualified and/or discretionary function immunity.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

8. Defendants assert that Plaintiff has failed to state any adverse employment action or damages caused by Defendants which violated Plaintiff's constitutional rights or for which any relief can be granted.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

9. Defendants assert that Plaintiff has failed to state any custom or policy of Defendants which violated Plaintiff's constitutional rights or for which any relief can be granted.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

10. Defendants plead that Plaintiff is not entitled to any award of damages.

RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

Defendants reserve the right to amend these affirmative defenses as discovered and allowed by the Court.

Respectfully submitted this the 21st day of August, 2007.

/s/Michael D. Boyle
MICHAEL D. BOYLE (BOY032)
Staff Attorney

CITY OF MONTGOMERY
Legal Department
Post Office Box 1111
Montgomery, Alabama 36101-1111
(334) 241-2050
(334) 241-2310

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that foregoing has been served upon the following by electronic filing/notification of the United States District Court Middle District of Alabama on this 21st day of August, 2007:

Deborah A. Mattison, Esq.
Rachel L. McGinley, Esq.
Wiggins, Childs, Quinn & Pantazis, LLC
The Kress Building
301 19th Street North
Birmingham, Alabama 35203
(205) 314-0500

/s/ Michael D. Boyle
Of Counsel